

REMARKS

By the present amendment, Applicant has amended Claim 1, and canceled Claim 7. Claims 1-6, and 8-20 remain pending in the present application. Claim 1 is the sole independent claim.

In the recent Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 4, 6-11, 13-18, and 20 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Ido et al. (US Pub Number 2002/0181853). The Examiner rejected claims 2 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ido et al. (US Pub Number 2002/0181853) in view of Ido et al. (2003/0194192). The Examiner rejected Claims 5, 12, and 19 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ido et al. (US Pub Number 2002/0181853) in view of Terada et al. (2002/0027230). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

The claims in this application have been revised to more particularly define Applicants' unique construction in view of the prior art of record. Reconsideration of the claims in light of the amendments and for the following reasons is respectfully requested.

Applicants have amended Claim 1 by reciting that the bias line is spaced from the high speed signal line in each of the transmitting and receiving devices. Claim 1 has also been amended to recite that the first dummy line is spaced from the high speed signal line for the light transmitting device, and that the second dummy line is spaced from the high speed signal line for the light receiving device. Claim 1 has further been amended to recite that the spacing between the first and second dummy ground lines and the respective high speed signal lines are less than or equal to the spacing between the respective bias lines and the high speed signal lines.

Applicants will advance arguments hereinbelow to illustrate the manner in which the presently claimed invention is patentably distinguishable from the cited and applied prior art reference to Ido et al. (Pub. '853). Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

The applied prior art reference to Ido et al. disclose that the ground pin (6-1) is closer to the microstrip (3-9) of Fig. 4, than the electrode pattern (3-11). This rationale of the Examiner is in error because Ido et al. discloses that the electrode pattern (3-11) is an internal component of the device package 2, where the ground pin 6-1 is connected to the package and performs an electromagnetic shield function (see [0049] page 4, lines 11-16). Specifically, the ground line of an ordinary transmission line, such as disclosed in Ido et al., is used as part of signal line for transmitting signals. So that when changes are made to the ground line, the characteristics of the signal line are also changed. Unlike the dummy lines of the present application, the dummy ground lines used are not for transmitting signals, rather they function to maintain and keep stable the transmission of signals by absorbing noise that is generated in transmitting signals.

Thus, the difference between the instant claims and the applied prior art reference to Ido et al., is that the signal transmission characteristic of transmission line of Ido et al. change however, the signal transmission

characteristic of signal line near the dummy ground line of the present case do not change irrespective of the size and width of the dummy ground line, only the amount of noise that is absorbed by the dummy ground line changes.

As such it is submitted that Ido et al do not anticipate Claim 1, as amended, and claims 3, 4, 6, 8-11, 13-18, and 20, depending therefrom, because Ido et al. do not disclose the structure as now recited in instant Claim 1. Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of this particular grounds of rejection.

With respect to the rejections under 35 USC 103(a), Applicants submit that these rejections are without merit.

The Examiner rejected Claim 2 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ido et al. (US Pub Number 2002/0181853) in view of Ido et al. (2003/0194192). Applicants submit that there is no disclosure found in Ido et al. ('853) or Ido et al. ('192) that teach the limitation that the substrate is composed of a silicon substrate having a silicon oxide film. Aside from some other positive recitation found in the prior art, Applicants respectfully submit that this particular grounds of rejection is unfounded, and should be withdrawn. Applicants request the withdrawal of this particular grounds of rejection.

The Examiner rejected Claims 5, 12, and 19 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ido et al. (US Pub Number 2002/0181853) in view of Terada et al. (2002/0027230). Terada et al. teach an optical transmitting and receiving device and the manufacturing method, where the device has an insulation film of silicon dioxide film laminated on a platform substrate of Si. There is no disclosure in either Ido et al. '853, nor Terada et al. teach the substrate composed of silicon oxide. Albeit, Ido et al. teach a substrate, but Ido et al. do not teach silicon oxide as a component of the substrate. Likewise, Terada et al. teach a substrate formed of silicon having an insulating film of silicon dioxide. Terada et al. do not teach the substrate composed of silicon oxide. Applicants respectfully submit that the combined teachings of Ido et al. '853 and Terada et al. do not teach the substrate composed of silicon oxide. As such, the relied upon prior art of record fails to meet the limitations of Claims 5, 12, and 19, and thus, are allowable.

It is respectfully submitted that for at least these reasons, independent Claim 1, along with Claims 2-6, and 8-20 dependent therefrom, are allowable over the applied prior art of record. For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. If such is not the case, the Examiner is requested to kindly contact the undersigned in an effort to satisfactorily conclude the prosecution of this application.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 07-1337 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

LOWE HAUPTMAN & BERNER, LLP

/Yoon S Ham/

Yoon S. Ham

Registration No. 45,307

Customer Number: 22429
1700 Diagonal Road, Suite 300
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
(703) 684-1111
(703) 518-5499 Facsimile
Date: April 19, 2007